R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 120 PS 000 828

FINAL REPORT ON HEAD START EVALUATION AND RESEARCH--1966-67 TO THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. SECTION IV, AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF ORAL LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AMONG CULTURALLY DIFFERENT CHILDREN.

BY- HUBBARD, JAMES L. ZARATE, LEONORE T.
TEXAS UNIV., AUSTIN,CHILD DEVELOP.EVAL.AND RES.CTR

REPORT NUMBER IED-66-1 PUB DATE 31 AUG 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.28 105P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT, ORAL EXPRESSION, *VERBAL ABILITY, CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, PRIMARY GRADES, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, RATING SCALES, READING ABILITY, ABILITY GROUPING, *STUDENT IMPROVEMENT, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, HEAD START, AUSTIN, TEXAS,

THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILD, ALTHOUGH VERY VERBAL IN HIS LOCAL ENVIRONMENT, IS USUALLY VERBALLY DEFICIENT WITH RESPECT TO SOCIETY AS A WHOLE. PART OF THE ANSWER TO PROVIDING A MORE EFFECTIVE LANGUAGE EDUCATION TO THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED YOUTH IS ENRICHMENT OR COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS LIKE HEAD START. TO INVESTIGATE THE EFFECT OF THE AUSTIN HEAD START PROGRAM ON THE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND ABILITY OF PRIMARY GRADE PUPILS, A 15-ITEM ORAL LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SCALE WAS CREATED TO EVALUATE THE LANGUAGE ABILITY OF 49 HEAD START AND 105 NON-HEAD START DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN THE FIRST AND SECOND GRADES. THE CHILDREN WERE ASKED QUESTIONS BY A TEACHER, AND THEIR SPONTANEOUS EXPRESSIONS WERE TAPED. THESE TAPED EXPRESSIONS WERE THEN INDEPENDENTLY EVALUATED BY 2 TEACHERS ON THE RATING SCALE, AND THE SCORES WERE RECORDED. THE SCORES WERE DIVIDED INTO 12 GROUPS REFLECTING THE DIFFERENCES IN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPATING PUPILS ON 3 DIMENSIONS, NAMELY, (1) HEAD START OR NON-HEAD START, (2) FIRST OR SECOND GRADE, AND (3) HIGH, MIDDLE, OR LOW READING ABILITY. AN EXAMPLE OF A GROUP DENOMINATION WOULD BE "HEAD START FIRST GRADERS OF MIDDLE READING ABILITY." SCORES FOR EACH GROUP WERE OBTAINED IN THE FALL OF 1966 AND AGAIN IN THE SPRING OF 1967. THE DATA SHOWED NO REAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE HEAD START AND NON-HEAD START GROUPS OVER THE OTHER 2 DIMENSIONS. A COMPARISON OF THE FALL AND SPRING SCORES SHOWED THAT ONLY MIDDLE ABILITY FIRST GRADE HEAD START PUPILS AND LOW ABILITY FIRST GRADE NON-HEAD START PUPILS MADE CONSIDERABLE IMPROVEMENT IN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT FROM THE FALL TO SPRING SESSION. THE INCONCLUSIVENESS OF THE RESULTS, A MATTER FOR FUTURE IMPROVEMENT, WAS MOST LIKELY DUE TO THE TYPE OF MEASURING PROCEDURE USED. (WD)

ED019120

FINAL REPORT ON

HEAD START EVALUATION AND RESEARCH: 1966-67

(Contract No. 66-1)

TO

THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

By

The Staff and Study Directors

CHILD DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION AND RESEARCH CENTER

John Pierce-Jones, Ph.D., Director

The University of Texas at Austin

August 31, 1967

PS000828

Section IV: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF ORAL LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AMONG CULTURALLY DIFFERENT CHILDREN

By

James L. Hubbard

Lenore T. Zarate

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT ON

HEAD START EVALUATION AND RESEARCH: 1966-67

(Contract No. 66-1)

TO

THE INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

By

The Staff and Study Directors

CHILD DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION AND RESEARCH CENTER

John Pierce-Jones, Ph.D., Director

The University of Texas at Austin

August 31, 1967

PS 000828

Section IV: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF ORAL LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AMONG CULTURALLY DIFFERENT CHILDREN

By

James L. Hubbard

Lenore T. Zarate

CHAPTER I

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT, CULTURE, AND THE PROBLEM

There has recently been increased attention to the importance of oral language development in the educative process of lower class children. Various terminology has been used to describe these children; the two most common descriptive terms are "culturally deprived" and "educationally disadvantaged." However, these terms have connotations of inferiority. While this may be true, we prefer to use the term "culturally different," that is, coming from a culture which is different from middle class, white, Anglo, American culture. As will be seen in this chapter, the main difficulties in educating these youngsters stem from the characteristics of the culture in which they live. It is, therefore, felt better to use this term to describe the children whom we are discussing.

For the most part, the children who attend schools which are entitled to aid under Title I of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (hereafter referred to as Title I schools) and those who attended classes of Operation Head Start are from the lower classes and culturally different. The characteristics discussed below are those which may be taken as describing the Title I and Head Start children. The terms "culturally different" and "Title I and Head Start" children are therefore here used interchangeably.

A number of recent studies have focussed upon the differences in verbal ability between these children and those from advantaged homes, as well as the reasons for these differences. This chapter discusses some of these writings and the conclusions which have been reached in an effort to present language ability as an integral part of educating the culturally different child.

Importance of Language in Child Development

There has been recognition of the importance of language in child development for a great many years. Beginning in 1900, George Herbert Mead (1934), the social psychologist, developed the view, which has become the basis of much sociological and psychological thought today, that language must develop before the self can. In his view, the kind of self which develops is a function, in part, of the kind of language which has developed. This is because it is through language that we communicate with others. The self as a social being cannot develop without this vital communication.

However, as Mukerji and Robison (1966, p. 460) point out, language has two functions: "as social communication as well as an indispensable tool for conceptualization." How it is used is explained by Hutt and Gibby (1959, p. 155) in discussing a child's third year of life:

Through increased locomotion he is able to get about more actively and independently and to explore the physical world around him. Through language he can do much more. He learns to understand the world of immediate experience in many different ways, for once he has words to conceptualize these experiences he can begin to differentiate them more effectively, to compare them, and even to summarize and to integrate them. He can also extend his world beyond that of immediate experience. He uses words to remember past events and to anticipate future ones. He learns to differentiate experiences from within (emotions) from experiences from without (external stimuli) in ever more reliable fashion. He used language to express his needs and to control the behavior of others. In these and other ways, language becomes a means of extending himself in time and space, and of enriching himself through direct participation with cultural experiences that can be shared with others.

It is evident, therefore, that language development is essential in fulfilling the potential of each individual. An excellent example is the case of Helen Keller who, until she was able to develop some form of language with which to communicate and conceptualize, was entirely without a social being.

Importance of Language in School

Obviously, what we have said up to now carries over to the school environment. But a good start in language ability has related aspects as well. A child starts school with a certain level of oral language development. This becomes the basis for whatever he achieves. He cannot learn to read without it, as explained by Strickland (1955, p. 12):

> In reading....one must do four things. One must recognize patterns of symbols as standing for certain words. One must put meaning into the words and blend the meaning of individual words into larger units of meaning. One must react so that there is active interpretation of meaning. And one must integrate the meaning, the vicarious experience, into himself.

If a child is deficient in language, whatever he tries to learn is affected. This is true because so much of the education process is taught by the written word and whatever is not is communicated verbally. The importance of language to learning is shown by Ruddell's (1966, p. 495) statement:

> The research reviewed indicates that oral language development serves as the underlying base for the development of reading and writing achievement. The child's ability to comprehend written material through reading and to express himself through written communication appears directly related to his maturity in the speaking and listening phases of language development.

Thus, we can see that oral language is vital in the learning process, specifically within the school. We now turn our attention to the culturally different child in particular.

Oral Language in Culturally Different Children

It is common generality that culturally different children are non-verbal---they simply do not talk! Riessman (1963, p. 6) says, "everybody in the school system, at one time or another, has heard that these children are inarticulate, and nonverbal." However, as we will see, this appears to be an oversimplification.

Basil Bernstein, the British sociologist, has divided the language of the different into two aspects (1959). He distinguishes between "formal language," or that of the written book, and "public language," or informal, everyday language. As Reissman (1963, p. 6) points out, it is in the formal aspect of language that the culturally different are deficient: "There is no question in my mind that there is a deficit in formal language." However, he goes on to say (1963, p. 6) that their "public" or informal language appears to be quite highly developed. "Aren't these children quite verbal --- in out-of-school situations, for example?"

What Reissman says is borne out by studies conducted by Martin Deutsch.* With a technique developed to elicit spontaneous expression, whereby a toy clown's nose lights up when the child talks (about anything), Deutsch found much more verbal expression in this situatinn. Other findings of these studies are:

1. Deprived children appear to be poor in the use of verbs, but much better with descriptive adjectives.
2. Deprived children seem to understand more language than they speak (their "receptive" linguistic ability is much better than their "expressive" language).
3. Deprived children demonstrate a surprising ability for phantasy (as seen in the clown situation).
4. Deprived children express themselves best in spontaneous, unstructured situations.

---

*This discussion is based upon that by Frank Reissman (1962, pp. 76-77). The studies were carried out by the Institute for Developmental Studies, Department of Psychiatry, New York Medical College.

Deutsch concludes:

> Thus, it is possible that the oft-stated conclusion on the verbal impoverishment of the child from the culturally deprived home is most striking when he is presented with highly structured tasks, and that verbal enrichment techniques, which take advantage of his freer flow of language in more unstructured situations, may help him to meet his language and scholastic potential.

Because the culturally different child <u>is</u> verbal, however, does not mean that it is a misconception that his language ability is a great problem in the educative process, for we must remember that he is verbal in terms of informal language, but that the school environment utilizes formal language. This becomes a great disadvantage to the Title I children. Riessman (1962, p. 74) says, "the greatest block to the realization of the deprived individual's creative potential appears to be his verbal inadequacies." Again, he says later on (1962, p. 80) "despite various sources of latent creativity, underprivileged children apparently do not realize their potential because of formal language deficiencies."

Let us now turn to an examination of how these language deficiencies come about.

<u>Environment and Language Development</u>

Hutt and Gibby (1959, p. 196) point out the importance of environment to language: "It has become increasingly clear that language development is greatly influenced, once a sufficient

degree of maturation hhs been attained, by a variety of environmental factors." Thess factors include the kind of experiences the child has and the kind of language used in the family and by the peer group. Since the environment is so different between middle class and lower class homes, it is important to consider them with regard to language development.

Middle Class. Middle class homes, which are for the most part culturally advantaged, are essentially verbal homes. Because of the values of middle class culture, parents play a major role in teaching their young, so that by the time they reach school age, these children have achieved a relatively high level of language ability. Their parents talk to them, read to them, and in general foster a verbal give and take which helps them to develop their potentialities. Bloom, Davis and Hess (1965, p. 15) put it this way:

> .....the child in many middle-class homes is given a great deal of instruction about the world in which he lives, to use language to fix aspects of thhs world in his memory, and to think about similarities, differences, and relationships in this very complex environment. Such instruction is individual and is timed in relation to the experiences, actions, and questions of the child. Parents make great efforts to motivate the child, to reward him, and to reinforce desired responses. The child is read to, spoken to, and is constantly subjected to a stimulating set of experiences in a very complex environment. In short, he "learns to learn" very early. He comes to view the world as something he can master through a relatively enjoyable type of activity, a sort of game, which is learning. In fact, much of the approval he gets is because of his rapid and accurate response to this informal instruction in the home.

Lower Class. The lower class culture, from which most Title I and Head Start children come, works to thwart the development so prevalent in middle class homes. Bloom, Davis and Hess (1965, p. 15) show how:

> While all of this is not absent in the culturally deprived home, it does not play such a central role in child rearing in such homes. The size of the family, the concern of the parents with the basic necessities of life, the low level of educational development of the parents, the frequent absence of a male parent, and the lack of a great deal of interaction between children and adults all conspire to reduce the stimulation, language development, and intellectual development of such children.

How this operates with regard to language development is evident. Lower class children are not read to, so that their world is not enlarged beyond their immediate surroundings. When they speak to their parents, the response is likely to be a nod of the head, or monosyllabic. Bloom, Davis and Hess (1965, pp. 70-71) say that, "When language is used, it is likely to be terse and not necessarily grammatically correct." Much communication is non-verbal, and the peer group becomes very important in socialization.

In addition to these linguistic problems of the culturally different, there are certain specific ones with regard to the two ethnic minorities which comprise most of our Title I and Head Start population, the Negroes and the Mexican-Americans. These difficulties are discussed below.

Negroes. Although the language of lower class Negroes is basically English, it can be regarded as a separate dialect. Several teachers in the Austin Title I schools have told this author that they cannot understand some of their Negro students, and that their speech is like a separate language because much of their vocabulary is different from that of the white children (and, of course, the teachers). A study by Thomas (1963) found that "Negroes used fewer mature sentence types and made more specific grammatical errors" than lower class white children. One can see that the lower class Negro child is at a more of a linguistic disadvantage than his white counterpart.

Mexican-Americans. The bilingual child of Mexican-American heritage has an even more accentuated problem. There have been several studies on bilingualism, some of which indicate the presence of what Tireman (1948) terms a "dual language handicap." Quoting from an early study by Barke and Williams (1938):

> The inference is that these bilingual children, aged ten and a half years, and drawn from two adjacent schools in a mining district, are unable to do justice to themselves in either language. Neither in their mother tongue nor in their second language did they have a vocabulary equal to that of the monoglot.

Again, from another early study by Walters (1935), "....the simultaneous learning of two languages produces a mental obfuscation or tangling which impedes the learning of other subjects."

The dual language handicap idea is supported and expanded by Manuel (1965, p.7)

> Typically, the Spanish-speaking child has to learn English as a second language and then to use this second language in his school work while his out-of-school language is mainly Spanish. The result for a large number of children is lack of sufficient mastery of any language. This makes learning more difficult and tends toward further isolation.

He further suggests (1965, p. 117) that whatever language difficulties we have discussed with regard to English apply as well to these children's learning of Spanish. Thus,

> Generally speaking, their home language is a poor grade of Spanish. Even the fund of ideas which words express is limited. In their homes they lack the opportunity and stimulus to develop the concepts which other children normally develop. In school the growth of ability in their mother tongue is arrested by lack of instruction in the written forms of the language, and the development of English is retarded by the lack of sufficient contact with English.

It is clear that these children will experience difficulties in school.

The Problem

What this all means in terms of education is well summarized in the following paragraphs by Bloom, Davis and Hess (1965, p. 71).

> Thus, the deprived child enters school inadequately prepared for the typical language tasks of the first grade. The greatest handicap seems to be a lack of familiarity with the speech used by teachers and insufficient practice in attending to prolonged speech sequences.

> In the long run, the language which the deprived child has learned at home is likely to be inadequate as an aid and tool in conceptualization. Furthermore, language serves as a means of social distinctions which can limit opportunities for mobility.

The purpose of the present research is to expand our knowledge of the specific language difficulties of culturally different children. One of the specific goals of the Head Start program is to provide and encourage basic language skills so that these youngsters will not be as handicapped when they begin school. Thus, the study of oral language development in Head Start and Title I children is useful in determining the effect upon later language ability of a preschool program aimed at improving, among other things, language skills. In other words, we have found from the above discussion that oral language development is important in educating Title I and Head Start children. This study is conducted so that we may know specific language deficiencies and use this knowledge in a training program to minimize these deficiencies and increase the learning potential of these culturally different children.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

The study of the oral language development of graduates of the Head Start Program in Austin is being conducted as part of the evaluation of Title I of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the Austin Independent School District. This chapter describes the methods and procedures used in measuring the oral language development of the children participating in these programs.

Development of the Instrument

In the proposal for Title I, it was indicated that an attempt would be made to improve reading ability. At first it was assumed that reading ability could be measured by using standard reading tests. However, because of the specific language difficulties of the culturally different population, it was felt that these standard tests were unsatisfactory. Under the assumption that reading ability is a function of oral language ability, it was decided to measure the oral language development of the Title I and Head Start children.

A number of instruments measuring oral language development were available. However, they had been developed for specific purposes and to be administered and evaluated by experts in the

field of oral language. It was decided not to use these instruments for two reasons: (a) we had no oral language experts; and (b) we wanted a more universal type of instrument rather than one related to any one specific purpose.

The reading supervisors in the schools, who are those most concerned, were then asked to submit an informal list of items which they felt were descriptive of oral language development---for example, pronunciation, enunciation, etc. These lists were then organized, condensed, and coordinated into one tentative list of items which was submitted again to the reading supervisors for comments and corrections. These were then refined into the fifteen item Oral Language Development Scale, which can be found at the end of this chapter. It turned out that eight of the items of the scale refer to mechanical aspects of oral language, and seven refer to expressiveness.[1]

---

[1]The items referring to mechanical aspects are: accurate pronunciation, clear enunciation, correct use of verbs, correct use of pronouns, use of expressive vocabulary, appropriate use of complete sentences, uses meaningful intonation, uses adjectives meaningfully. The expressive items are: spontaneous expression, expresses ideas verbally with facility, speaks self-confidently, responds appropriately to questioning, interacts verbally with members of the group, expresses judgments and inferences verbally, and relates facts and ideas logically.

Procedure

Sample Selection. The counselor at each of the Title I schools[2] was contacted in the Fall of 1966 and asked to select one classroom teacher in each grade.[3] Each teacher was then requested to select two of her better students, two poorer students, and two in between. Generally, these selections were made on the basis of the reading group to which they had been assigned. This yielded a sample of 180 children--90 in grade 1 and 90 in grade 2.[4]

After the sample was selected, the names were matched against the master lists of all Head Start participants in Austin in order to determine which of the children were Head Start graduates. The numbers and percentages of Head Start and Title I children in the final sample are given in Table A.

---

[2]There are 16 Title I schools in the Austin Independent School District but two of them have only three grades each -- one has grades 1-3 and the other grades 4-6. Since our study is concerned with grades 1 and 2 only, this limits the number of schools to 15. The criterion for schools to be eligible for aid under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is that 85-90 per cent of the family income of the student body must be under the poverty level of $3,000 per year.

[3]This was done for all six grades. However, for this study only grades 1 and 2 were used.

[4]For the Fall testing, one school was excluded so that the sample size was reduced by six in each grade for a total number of 168. Some children were lost to the sample during the school year. The final sample consisted of 154 children.

Obtaining the Tape Recordings. The decision was made to obtain samples of the children's speech on tape recordings for two major reasons: (a) with the use of tapes, an independent judgment could be obtained, for example, by the reading supervisors, and others; and (b) the tapes offered some measure of standardization of procedure among the teachers. In both grades, there was a total of 60 teachers (30 classroom teachers and 30 reading teachers--this will be explained below) and the use of tapes, while not guaranteeing absolute control, offered them some guidelines.

The teachers were instructed to obtain samples of the children's speech in a spontaneous, unrehearsed manner ranging from one to five minutes in length. This was to be done in such a way, wherever possible, that all items on the scale could be evaluated. For example, the teachers were to ask questions so that they could rate the child on the item, "Responds appropriately to questioning." Most of the teachers had at least one practice session with the tape recorder to acquaint themselves and the children with its use.

Evaluation of Tapes. Once the tapes were obtained, each classroom teacher listened to the tape for her class and rated each child on the Oral Language Development Scale. A second teacher, usually the special reading teacher for that grade, then listened

Table A. Numbers and Percentages of Head Start and Title I Children, Grades 1 and 2, 14 Title I Elementary Schools, Spring, 1967 Final Sample

	Head Start		Title I		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Grade 1	25	31.2	55	68.8	80	100.0
High achievement	5	19.2	21	80.8	26	100.0
Middle achievement	13	46.4	15	53.6	28	100.0
Low achievement	7	26.9	19	73.1	26	100.0
Grade 2	24	32.4	50	67.6	74	100.0
High achievement	8	30.8	18	69.2	26	100.0
Middle achievement	8	29.6	19	70.4	27	100.0
Low achievement	8	38.1	13	61.9	21	100.0

to the same tape and rated each child independently of the first teacher. Thus, there are two separate ratings on each item for each child.

Repetition in Spring. The teachers followed the same procedures with the same children in obtaining tape recordings and evaluating them in the Spring of 1967. This would allow an evaluation of the influence of school upon the oral language development of Head Start and Title I children. As yet, only the results of the Fall testing have been tabulated and thus only these first results are presented in this report.

Statistical Analysis

Teacher Agreement. In order to determine the degree of agreement between the two groups of rating teachers, a measure of the degree of association between their ratings (coefficients of correlation) are being computed for all subjects in the sample.

Computation of Mean Scores. Mean, or average, scores are computed for each of the fifteen items and total scale scores for each group of rating teachers. These means are computed for each subgroup in the sample as follows:

I. Grade 1
   A. Head Start
      1. High achievement students
      2. Middle achievement students
      3. Low achievement students
   B. Title I
      1. High achievement students
      2. Middle achievement students
      3. Low achievement students

II. Grade 2
   A. Head Start
      1. High achievement students
      2. Middle achievement students
      3. Low achievement students
   B. Title I
      1. High achievement students
      2. Middle achievement students
      3. Low achievement students

Statistical Significance. Because the data for this investigation were based upon a sample of student ratings and not the ratings of all students in the schools studied, some account had to be taken of the possibility that our results might have been different with different students. This was done by applying tests of statistical significance to our findings. By means of these tests (specifically, the "t-test" for differences between means), the probability was determined that any differences found might have been a "chance" occurrence (that is, a result of variations due to sampling rather than a difference connected with the operation of the variables under study). For example, if a difference of 0.5 were found between the average scores of two subgroups on a given item, the likelihood that this is a chance occurrence

could be determined. If the likelihood were .1, the chances would be 1 in 10 that the difference might occur by chance and, conversely, 9 in 10 that the difference would be related to the factors being investigated.*

Tests for the statistical significance of the differences between two means were performed on item scores and total scale scores for the following subgroups in each grade:

1. Head Start and Title I means, high achievement students
2. Head Start and Title I means, middle achievement students
3. Head Start and Title I means, low achievement students
4. High and low achievement means, Head Start students
5. High and low achievement means, Title I students

This will be repeated with the results of the Spring testing. In addition, computations will be made on the differences between the Fall and Spring results for each subgroup to determine whether any specific subgroups have changed significantly over time.

The next chapter presents the results of the Fall, 1966 testing.

---

*This does not imply causality but does imply a relationship.

Date_____ School_____

Student_____ Grade_____

Rating Teacher (Please check): Classroom_____Title I (or other 2nd teacher)_____

Reading Group Assignment (Please check): Top___ Middle___ Low_____

ORAL LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SCALE

Each of the following statements describes a characteristic of oral language development. Please identify your rating of each aspect of the student's language performance in terms of the scale below. In the space provided to the left of each item write the number associated with the statement most descriptive of your judgment. Judgments are to be based on the typical performance expected for the child's chronological age.

1. - Inferior
2. - Below average
3. - Typical or average for age group
4. - Above average
5. - Superior

_____1. Accurate pronunciation

_____2. Clear enunciation

_____3. Spontaneous expression

_____4. Correct use of verbs

_____5. Correct use of pronouns

_____6. Use of expressive vocabulary

_____7. Appropriate use of complete sentences

_____8. Expresses ideas verbally with facility

_____9. Speaks self-confidently

_____10. Responds appropriately to questioning

_____11. Uses meaningful intonation

_____12. Interacts verbally with members of group

_____13. Expresses judgments and inferences verbally

_____14. Uses adjectives meaningfully

_____15. Relates facts and ideas logically

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Initial Testing, Fall, 1966

Overall Oral Language Ability

Each item on the fifteen item scale measuring oral language development was rated as follows:

1 Inferior
2 Below Average
3 Average
4 Above Average
5 Superior

Thus, an individual rated "inferior" received a score of 1, "below average" a score of 2, and so on.

In examining Tables 1-10, it is evident that none of these students, not even the better reading students, were rated "above average" (3.5 is the highest score received) on any aspect of oral language ability. Most of the students have been rated "below average" in both the first and second grades on many aspects. It is therefore important to remember that regardless of the differences that show up between the Head Start and Title I students they are, for the most part, children who are culturally deprived, and who do not meet the standards of most middle class children in the area of oral language skills.

Grade 1, Head Start vs. Title I

Examination of Tables 1-3 reveals that in the first grade there are few statistically significant differences between the Head Start students and Title I (excluding Head Start) students. In the high reading group (Table I), there are only two items which show significant differences, in the middle reading group (Table 2), only one, and in the low reading group (Table 3), none. Only one of the two groups of rating teachers[1] finds these differences.[2] In all three instances of significant differences, the Title I students are rated higher than the Head Start students. Moreover, the differences that do occur do not appear in any one area of oral language, either mechanics or expressiveness. There appears, on the basis of these findings, to be very little difference between Head Start and Title I students in the first grade.

---

[1]Hereafter, when we say first or second rating teacher, we are referring to the first or second groups of rating teachers.

[2]When the two groups of teachers do not agree on either the number of items or the specific items which show significant differences, the question arises as to which set of findings, if any, we are to take as meaningful, or whether to consider the finding of any significant differences as meaningful no matter who did the scoring. Of course, the results are considered the most meaningful in those cases in which both groups of teachers agreed on the differences.

Table 1. High Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences Between Means, Initial Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p*	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p*
Accurate Pronounciation	3.0	2.8	.6	2.5	2.8	.4
Clear Enunciation	2.7	2.9	.7	2.5	2.8	.3
Spontaneous Expression	2.8	3.3	.3	2.8	3.0	.7
Correct Use of Verbs	2.3	3.0	.1	2.7	2.9	.7
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.8	3.1	.4	2.8	2.9	.8
Expressive Vocabulary	2.8	3.4	.2	2.8	2.9	.9
Appropriate Use of Complete Sentences	2.3	3.2	.05**	2.3	2.9	.2
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.8	3.3	.2	2.7	3.0	.6
Speaks Self Confidently	3.0	3.3	.5	2.8	3.2	.4
Responds Appropriately to Questioning	3.2	3.5	.4	2.7	3.5	.1
Uses Meaningful Intonation	2.5	3.0	.3	2.2	2.8	.3
Interacts Verbally With Group	2.8	3.4	.01**	3.0	3.1	.8
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.2	3.4	.6	2.8	2.7	.8

Table 1 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title 1	1st Teacher p*	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title 1	2nd Teacher p*
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	3.0	.6	2.7	2.9	.7
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.2	3.5	.3	3.0	2.8	.6
Total Scale Score	42.5	48.3	.2	41.0	44.1	.5

*P = Probability of chance occurrence of the difference between the two means. The smaller the probability, the less likelihood the difference occurs by chance.

** Difference statistically significant.

Table 2. Middle Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences Between Means, Initial Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronounciation	2.7	2.7	-	2.3	2.5	.4
Clear Enunciation	2.4	2.7	.2	2.4	2.5	.7
Spontaneous Expression	2.9	2.7	.5	2.5	2.8	.3
Correct Use of Verbs	2.2	2.5	.3	2.4	2.3	.7
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.2	2.5	.3	2.3	2.7	.2
Expressive Vocabulary	2.7	2.7	-	2.5	2.5	-
Complete Sentences	2.3	2.5	.6	2.3	2.6	.4
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.5	2.7	.4	2.5	3.0	.1
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.0	2.6	.2	2.8	2.5	.3
Responds to Questioning	3.0	2.9	.8	2.8	3.0	.4
Meaningful Intonation	2.8	2.7	.8	2.2	2.9	.01*
Interacts Verbally With Group	3.0	2.8	.3	2.7	2.8	.7
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.6	2.7	.7	2.5	2.7	.5

Table 2 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title 1	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.3	2.5	.4	2.2	2.6	.2
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.8	2.8	-	2.7	2.7	-
Total Scale Score	39.4	40.0	.9	37.0	40.0	.3

* Difference Statistically Significant

Table 3. Low Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Initial Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronounciation	1.7	2.0	.5	1.9	1.9	-
Clear Enunciation	1.6	2.0	.3	1.9	1.9	-
Spontaneous Expression	2.6	2.2	.4	2.6	2.4	.6
Correct Use Of Verbs	1.9	1.9	-	2.0	1.9	.8
Correct Use of Pronouns	1.7	2.0	.4	2.3	1.9	.3
Expressive Vocabulary	2.1	2.0	.8	2.1	2.1	-
Complete Sentences	2.0	2.0	-	2.1	2.0	.8
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	1.9	1.9	-	2.1	2.0	.9
Speaks self-Confidently	2.4	2.2	.7	2.6	2.3	.5
Responds to Questioning	1.9	2.3	.3	2.4	2.4	-
Meaningful Intonation	2.1	2.0	.8	2.4	2.0	.3
Interacts Verbally with Group	2.3	2.4	.9	2.5	2.5	-
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	1.9	2.2	.4	2.4	2.1	.4

Table 3 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	1.9	1.9	-	2.0	1.9	.8
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	1.7	2.1	.4	2.1	2.0	.8
Total Scale Score	29.6	30.8	.8	33.4	31.1	.6

Grade 1, High vs. Low,[3] Head Start and Title I

Head Start

Table 4 shows the comparison between the high and low reading groups for the Head Start students only. The first rating teacher scored eight items and total scale scores with significant differences. Four of these items referred to mechanics and four to expressiveness. The second rating teacher scored only one item with significant differences. This item referred to expressiveness and was one of those in which the first teacher also found significant differences. Thus, it is difficult to draw any definite conclusions. Depending upon which rating teacher one stresses, there may be some differences in overall language ability between the students with better reading skills and those with poorer skills among the Head Start group.

Title I

Table 5 shows the comparison between the high and low reading groups for the Title I students only. Here both rating teachers agree in all cases. Significant differences are found on all items and on total scale scores. Therefore, we can say with some confidence that among the Title I students there is a clear-cut difference in overall language ability between the better reading students and the poorer ones.

---

[3] In all of these high vs. low comparisons, and in the second grade as well, the high reading group scored higher than the low reading group.

Table 4. Head Start Students, Grade 1. Mean Scores of High and Low Reading Groups and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Initial Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronounciation	3.0	1.7	.01*	2.5	1.9	.2
Clear Enunciation	2.7	1.6	.02*	2.5	1.9	.2
Spontaneous Expression	2.8	2.6	.7	2.8	2.6	.6
Correct Use of Verbs	2.3	1.9	.3	2.7	2.0	.1
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.8	1.7	.001*	2.8	2.3	.2
Expressive Vocabulary	2.8	2.1	.2	2.8	2.1	.2
Complete Sentences	2.3	2.0	.5	2.3	2.1	.7
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.8	1.9	.05*	2.7	2.1	.3
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.0	2.4	.3	2.8	2.6	.7
Responds to Questioning	3.2	1.9	.01*	2.7	2.4	.6
Meaningful Intonation	2.5	2.1	.3	2.2	2.4	.7
Interacts Verbally With Group	2.8	2.3	.3	3.0	2.5	.4
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.2	1.9	.01*	2.8	2.4	.2

Table 4 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	1.9	.02*	2.7	2.0	.2
Relates Facts and Ideas Logically	3.2	1.7	.01*	3.0	2.1	.05*
Total Scale Score	42.5	29.6	.01*	41.0	33.4	.1

*Difference Statistically Significant

Table 5. Title I Students, Grade 1. Mean Scores of High and Low Reading Groups and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Initial Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronounciation	2.8	2.0	.01*	2.8	1.9	.001*
Clear Enunciation	2.9	2.0	.01*	2.8	1.9	.001*
Spontaneous Expression	3.3	2.2	.001*	3.0	2.4	.05*
Correct Use of Verbs	3.0	1.9	.001*	2.9	1.9	.001*
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.1	2.0	.001*	2.9	1.9	.001*
Expressive Vocabulary	3.4	2.0	.001*	2.9	2.1	.02*
Complete Sentences	3.2	2.0	.001*	2.9	2.0	.01*
Expresses Ideas Verbally With Facility	3.3	1.9	.001*	3.0	2.0	.01*
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.3	2.2	.001*	3.2	2.3	.01*
Responds to Questioning	3.5	2.3	.001*	3.5	2.4	.001*
Meaningful Intonation	3.0	2.0	.001*	2.8	2.0	.01*
Interacts Verbally With Group	3.4	2.4	.001*	3.1	2.5	.02*
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.4	2.2	.001*	2.7	2.1	.05*

Table 5 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher P	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher P
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	3.0	1.9	.001*	2.9	1.9	.001*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.5	2.1	.001*	2.8	2.0	.01*
Total Scale Score	48.3	30.8	.001*	44.1	31.1	.001*

*Difference statistically significant

Grade 2, Head Start vs. Title I

Examination of Tables 6-8 reveals a different picture in considering the Head Start vs. Title I students in the second grade. In the high reading group (Table 6), there were no significant differences. In the middle reading group (Table 7), the first rating teacher scored seven items and the total scale score with significant differences, and the second rating teacher scored eight items and total scale score with significant differences. Agreement between the teachers occurred on three items and total scores. In all instances of significant differences the Head Start students were rated higher than the Title I students (as opposed to the situation in the first grade). Of the items with differences found by the first teacher, one referred to mechanics and six to expressiveness; of those found by the second teacher, three referred to mechanics and five to expressiveness. [All three items on which both teachers agreed referred to expressiveness.

In the low reading group (Table 8), the first rating teacher scored one item and the second rating teacher scored eight items with significant differences. The item in which the first teacher found differences referred to expressiveness and was one of those in which the second teacher also found differences. Of the items with differences found by the second teacher, three referred to mechanics and five to expressiveness.

Table 6. High Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Initial Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	3.0	2.7	.3	2.9	2.9	-
Clear Enunciation	2.6	2.7	.8	2.8	2.7	.9
Spontaneous Expression	3.3	3.1	.6	3.1	3.1	-
Correct Use of Verbs	3.0	2.8	.6	2.9	2.9	-
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.9	3.1	.4	2.9	3.0	.8
Expressive Vocabulary	3.1	3.0	.8	2.9	2.9	-
Complete Sentences	3.1	3.3	.5	2.9	2.9	-
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.1	2.9	.5	3.3	3.1	.6
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.3	3.2	.8	3.0	3.4	.3
Responds to Questioning	3.3	3.3	-	3.1	3.4	.5
Meaningful Intonation	3.0	2.7	.4	2.9	2.7	.6
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.3	3.3	-	3.5	3.4	.8
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.3	3.1	.5	3.3	2.9	.4

Table 6 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	2.8	-	3.0	3.0	-
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.3	3.3	-	3.3	3.5	.6
Total Scale Score	46.1	45.6	.9	45.5	45.8	1.0

Table 7. Middle Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Initial Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.6	2.4	.5	3.0	2.4	.1
Clear Enunciation	2.6	2.4	.5	3.0	2.5	.05*
Spontaneous Expression	3.4	2.8	.02*	3.4	2.3	.01*
Correct Use of Verbs	2.8	2.5	.2	2.8	2.3	.05*
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.0	2.5	.05*	2.8	2.4	.3
Expressive Vocabulary	3.3	2.7	.05*	3.1	2.4	.02*
Complete Sentences	2.9	2.6	.4	2.9	2.3	.05*
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.4	2.6	.01*	3.1	2.7	.2
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.4	2.7	.05*	2.9	2.6	.4
Responds to Questioning	3.3	2.9	.05*	3.3	3.0	.2
Meaningful Intonation	3.1	2.8	.3	3.1	2.5	.1
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.1	2.7	.2	3.3	2.6	.05*
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.4	2.5	.01*	3.3	2.5	.02*

Table 7 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	Mean Score Title I	P	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	Mean Score Title I	P
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.6	2.5	.8	2.9	2.4	.2
Relates Facts and Ideas Logically	3.3	2.8	.1	3.3	2.6	.05*
Total Scale Score	46.0	39.2	.02*	45.9	37.2	.02*

*Difference Statistically Significant

Table 8. Low Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Initial Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.3	2.1	.6	2.6	2.1	.2
Clear Enunciation	2.4	2.1	.3	2.8	2.3	.3
Spontaneous Expression	2.8	2.6	.6	3.1	2.2	.05*
Correct Use of Verbs	2.6	2.3	.4	2.7	2.1	.2
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.8	2.4	.3	2.8	2.1	.05*
Expressive Vocabulary	2.7	2.3	.3	2.8	2.1	.1
Complete Sentences	2.3	2.4	.8	2.8	1.9	.05*
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.4	2.3	.8	2.9	2.0	.05*
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.7	2.5	.6	3.0	2.3	.2
Responds to Questioning	2.8	2.5	.4	3.1	2.6	.1
Meaningful Intonation	2.7	2.3	.3	2.8	2.1	.2
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.0	2.3	.05*	3.2	2.7	.02*
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.6	2.4	.6	3.1	2.1	.01*

Table 8 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.4	2.1	.5	2.8	1.9	.02*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.7	2.6	.8	3.1	2.3	.05*
Total Scale Score	39.1	35.1	.4	39.3	32.7	.2

*Difference Statistically Significant

It appears, therefore, that some differences are beginning to show up between the Head Start and Title I students, but that these differences lie mostly in the area of expressiveness. The differences are sharpest, moreover, within the middle reading group and less clear-cut in the low reading group. The top reading group is not affected at all.

Grade 2, High vs. Low, Head Start and Title I

Head Start

Table 9 shows the comparison between the high and low reading groups for the Head Start students only. Here, only the first rating teacher found two items with significant differences and total scale scores. Both items referred to mechanics. Thus, there was less difference here than in the first grade between the better and poorer reading students.

Title I

Table 10 shows the comparison between the high and low reading groups for the Title I students only. The first rating teacher found significant differences in total scale scores and on twelve items, five of which referred to mechanics and seven to expressiveness. The second rating teacher found differences in total scale scores and on thirteen items, five of which referred to mechanics and eight to expressiveness. The two teachers agreed on eleven items.

Table 9. Head Start Students, Grade 2. Mean Scores of High and Low Reading Groups and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Initial Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	3.0	2.3	.02*	2.9	2.6	.5
Clear Enunciation	2.6	2.4	.5	2.8	2.8	-
Spontaneous Expression	3.3	2.8	.2	3.1	3.1	-
Correct Use of Verbs	3.0	2.6	.3	2.9	2.7	.7
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.9	2.8	.7	2.9	2.8	.8
Expressive Vocabulary	3.1	2.7	.3	2.9	2.8	.9
Complete Sentences	3.1	2.3	.05*	2.9	2.8	.9
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.1	2.4	.1	3.3	2.9	.4
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.3	2.7	.2	3.0	3.0	-
Responds to Questioning	3.3	2.8	.1	3.1	3.1	-
Meaningful Intonation	3.0	2.7	.5	2.9	2.8	.9
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.3	3.0	.4	3.5	3.2	.3
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.3	2.6	.2	3.3	3.1	.5

Table 9 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	2.4	.3	3.0	2.8	.6
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.3	2.7	.2	3.3	3.1	.6
Total Scale Score	46.1	39.1	.05*	45.5	39.3	.2

*Difference Statistically Significant

Table 10. Title I Students, Grade 2. Mean Scores of High and Low Reading Groups and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Initial Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher P	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher P
Accurate Pronunciation	2.7	2.1	.05*	2.9	2.1	.05*
Clear Enunciation	2.7	2.1	.05*	2.7	2.3	.3
Spontaneous Expression	3.1	2.6	.1	3.1	2.2	.05*
Correct Use of Verbs	2.8	2.3	.1	2.9	2.1	.05*
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.1	2.4	.01*	3.0	2.1	.001*
Expressive Vocabulary	3.0	2.3	.05*	2.9	2.1	.05*
Complete Sentences	3.3	2.4	.001*	2.9	1.9	.01*
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.9	2.3	.05*	3.1	2.0	.001*
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.2	2.5	.05*	3.4	2.3	.01*
Responds to Questioning	3.3	2.5	.01*	3.4	2.6	.01*
Meaningful Intonation	2.7	2.3	.2	2.7	2.1	.1
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.3	2.3	.001*	3.4	2.7	.01*
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.1	2.4	.05*	2.9	2.1	.01*

Table 10 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	2.1	.05*	3.0	1.9	.001*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.3	2.6	.001*	3.5	2.3	.001*
Total Scale Score	45.6	35.1	.01*	45.8	32.7	.01*

*Difference Statistically Significant

Therefore, although slightly less so than in the first grade, we still found definite differences in language ability between the better reading students and the poorer ones in the Title I group.

Summary and Conclusions

While there is little difference in the overall average scores between the Head Start and Title I students in the first grade, the Head Start group is more homogeneous in their language ability than the Title I students, regardless of their reading group assignments. Furthermore, this appears to be true of all aspects of oral language development, since the differences which occur in both the Head Start and Title I groups are divided evenly between the mechanical and expressive items on the scale.

In the second grade there is even more homogeneity among the Head Start students, while there still exist definite differences between better and poorer students in the Title I group. When we consider that the Head Start students were rated significantly higher on several items than the Title I students, we begin to see an improvement in the quality of verbal skills among those who have participated in the Head Start program. We must remember two points, though: (1) the superior performance among Head Start students has more to do with the expressiveness of these students than with the mechanical aspects of language ability. In other

words, they seem to be expressing themselves more, but there is less difference in how well they do it; (2) this superior performance in expressiveness shows up among the middle and, to a lesser extent, the poorer students, not among the better students who have a relatively high level of oral language development to begin with.

On the basis of these findings, there appears to be a relationship between the Head Start program and the ability to express themselves of those participating children who would be assumed to have a relatively poor performance otherwise. This relationship is more evident in the second grade than in the first. If these conclusions are accurate, we expect them to be borne out by the results of the final testing in the Spring, 1967.

FINAL TESTING, SPRING, 1967

Correlation Between Teacher Ratings

Zero-order correlations were tabulated for the post-test ratings between teachers on each of the 472 subjects in the total sample, grades one through six. Space does not permit presenting all of the results here. However, all of these coefficients of correlation were extremely high. There were none below .99. Thus, there was a high degree of agreement between two teachers when rating a given child in the sample.

Table 11. High Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences Between Means, Final Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.6	3.4	.05*	2.8	3.3	.3
Clear Enunciation	2.4	3.3	.06	2.8	3.2	.6
Spontaneous Expression	2.8	3.6	.1	3.2	3.7	.3
Correct Use of Verbs	2.6	3.5	.03*	3.0	3.1	.7
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.8	3.7	.005*	3.2	3.1	.8
Expressive Vocabulary	3.0	3.8	.07	3.2	3.6	.7
Complete Sentences	3.0	3.7	.1	3.2	3.1	.9
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.8	3.7	.06	3.2	3.5	.6
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.8	3.8	.05*	3.4	3.7	.5
Responds to Questioning	3.4	3.8	.6	3.8	3.6	.6
Meaningful Intonation	2.8	3.6	.1	3.0	3.5	.2
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.0	3.5	.2	2.6	3.4	.2
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.8	3.7	.06	3.2	3.5	.5

Table 11 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	3.4	.2	3.0	3.4	.1
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.0	3.8	.04*	3.4	3.3	.9
Total Scale Score	42.6	54.2	.02*	47.0	51.2	.6

*Difference Statistically Significant

Table 12. Middle Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences Between Means, Final Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.8	2.9	.9	2.9	2.8	.6
Clear Enunciation	3.1	2.6	.1	2.9	2.5	.05*
Spontaneous Expression	3.2	3.1	.9	3.1	2.9	.3
Correct Use of Verbs	2.8	3.0	.6	2.9	2.4	.01*
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.1	2.8	.2	3.0	2.5	.04*
Expressive Vocabulary	3.2	3.0	.6	3.2	2.6	.01*
Complete Sentences	3.1	3.2	.6	3.0	2.5	.03*
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.1	3.0	.8	3.0	2.7	.06
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.3	2.9	.1	3.8	2.8	.9
Responds to Questioning	3.3	3.1	.6	3.2	2.9	.05*
Meaningful Intonation	3.1	3.0	.7	3.0	2.7	.1
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.5	3.0	.04*	2.9	2.5	.3
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.3	2.9	.1	3.1	2.5	.001*

(Table 12 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	Mean Score Low	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	Mean Score Low	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	3.0	2.7	.2	2.9	2.4	.003*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.6	2.7	.02*	3.2	2.6	.02*
Total Scale Score	46.2	43.7	.6	45.2	39.3	.001*

*Difference Statistically Significant

Table 13. Low Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences Between Means, Final Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.6	2.4	.6	2.3	2.3	.9
Clear Enunciation	2.4	2.4	-	2.1	2.4	.6
Spontaneous Expression	2.6	2.6	.9	2.6	2.6	.9
Correct Use of Verbs	2.4	2.3	.7	2.6	2.2	.2
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.4	2.4	.8	2.6	2.5	.8
Expressive Vocabulary	2.6	2.5	.9	2.3	2.5	.6
Complete Sentences	2.3	2.4	.8	2.0	2.3	.3
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.3	2.2	.8	2.3	2.5	.6
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.7	2.4	.6	2.7	2.5	.6
Responds to Questioning	2.7	2.5	.7	2.6	2.6	.8
Meaningful Intonation	2.9	2.6	.6	2.6	2.7	.7
Interacts Verbally with Group	2.9	2.7	.6	2.4	2.7	.5
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.3	2.3	.9	2.4	2.5	.9

Table 13 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.3	2.4	.6	2.3	2.3	.9
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.3	2.5	.6	2.4	2.6	.5
Total Scale Score	37.6	36.6	.8	36.1	37.2	.8

Grade 1, Head Start vs. Title I

Examination of Tables 11-13 reveals some significant differences between Head Start and Title I students. In the high reading group, there were five items and total score with significant differences found by one group of rating teachers. On all of these items the Title I students were rated higher than the Head Start students. Three of the items had to do with mechanical aspects of oral language development and two were related to expressive aspects. In the middle reading group, one group of teachers found two items (both relating to expressiveness) and the second group of teachers found nine items and total score with significant differences, with agreement between teachers on one item. In all cases of significant differences, the Head Start students were rated higher than the Title I students. Of the nine items with significant differences as rated by the second teacher, six had to do with mechanics and three had to do with expressiveness. In the low reading group there were no significant differences. Thus there had been some improvement in the high and middle reading groups. In the high group, the Title I students did better than the Head Start students, and this appeared in both mechanical and expressive aspects. Among the middle group, the Head Start students were rated significantly higher on several items, but most of these differences were in mechanical aspects.

Table 14. Head Start Students, Grade 1. Mean Scores of High and Low Reading Groups and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Final Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.6	2.6	-	2.8	2.3	.3
Clear Enunciation	2.4	2.4	.9	2.8	2.1	.09
Spontaneous Expression	2.8	2.6	.7	3.2	2.6	.2
Correct Use of Verbs	2.6	2.4	.6	3.0	2.6	.6
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.8	2.4	.2	3.2	2.6	.2
Expressive Vocabulary	3.0	2.6	.3	3.2	2.3	.07
Complete Sentences	3.0	2.3	.06	3.2	2.0	.003*
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.8	2.3	.09	3.2	2.3	.2
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.8	2.7	.9	3.4	2.7	.04*
Responds to Questioning	3.4	2.7	.2	3.8	2.6	.01*
Meaningful Intonation	2.8	2.9	.9	3.0	2.6	.6
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.0	2.9	.8	2.6	2.4	.8
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.8	2.3	.09	3.2	2.4	.1

Table 14 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	2.3	.09	3.0	2.3	.06
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.0	2.3	.06	3.4	2.4	.04*
Total Scale Score	42.6	37.6	.3	47.0	36.1	.05*

*Difference statistically significant

Grade 1, High vs. Low, Head Start and Title I

Head Start

Table 14 shows the comparison between the high and low reading groups among Head Start students only. The first rating teacher scored no items with significant differences, while the second teacher scored four items with significant differences. Three of these items referred to expressiveness and one to mechanics. Thus, even if we were to stress the ratings of the second teacher, there were few differences between the better and poorer reading students in the Head Start group. In any case, there were fewer differences than were found in the Fall.

Title I

Table 15 shows the comparison between the high and low reading groups among Title I students only. The first teacher rated all items and total scores with significant differences, and the second teacher rated 14 of 15 items and total scores with significant differences. (It is interesting to note that the remaining item borders on statistical significance.) Thus, there were definite differences between better and poorer reading students in the Title I group and this applied to both mechanical and expressive aspects of oral language development.

Table 15. Title I Students, Grade 1. Mean Scores of High and Low Reading Groups and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Final Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	3.4	2.4	.001*	3.3	2.3	.001*
Clear Enunciation	3.3	2.4	.003*	3.2	2.4	.008*
Spontaneous Expression	3.6	2.6	.002*	3.7	2.6	.001*
Correct Use of Verbs	3.5	2.3	.0001*	3.1	2.2	.001*
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.7	2.4	0*	3.1	2.5	.07
Expressive Vocabulary	3.8	2.5	.0002*	3.6	2.5	.0002*
Complete Sentences	3.7	2.4	.001*	3.1	2.3	.03
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.7	2.2	.0001*	3.5	2.5	.002*
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.8	2.4	.0001*	3.7	2.5	.0001*
Responds to Questioning	3.8	2.5	.001*	3.6	2.6	.0004*
Meaningful Intonation	3.6	2.6	.001*	3.5	2.7	.001*
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.5	2.7	.001*	3.4	2.7	.03*
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.7	2.3	.0001*	3.5	2.5	.0002*

Table 15 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	3.4	2.4	.001*	3.4	2.3	.0001*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.8	2.5	0*	3.3	2.6	.009*
Total Scale Score	54.2	36.6	0*	51.2	37.2	.0001*

*Difference Statistically Significant

Grade 1, pre-test vs. post-test, Head Start and Title I

Head Start

Tables 16-18 show the differences between pre- and post-tests for Head Start students. In the high reading group, only one teacher rated one item (mechanical) with significant differences. Thus, there had been little improvement in oral language development within this group. In the middle reading group, the first teacher rated seven items (five mechanical and two expressive) with significant differences. The second teacher rated 13 items (eight mechanical and five expressive) and total scores with significant differences. These items included the seven items of the first teacher. Thus, there had been considerable improvement in this group, with most of it coming in the mechanics of oral language. In the low reading group, the first teacher rated five items (four mechanical and one expressive) and total scores with significant differences, while the second teacher found none. Thus, there had been little or no improvement (depending upon the teacher) in this group, and what improvement there was showed up in mechanical aspects.

Title I

Tables 19-21 show the differences between pre- and post-tests for Title I students. In the high group, the first teacher found seven items (five mechanical and two expressive) and total

Table 16. Head Start Students, High Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	3.0	2.6	.6	2.4	2.8	.3
Clear Enunciation	2.6	2.4	.8	2.6	2.8	.6
Spontaneous Expression	3.0	2.8	.8	3.0	3.2	.8
Correct Use of Verbs	2.4	2.6	.7	2.6	3.0	.2
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.8	2.8	-	2.8	3.2	.3
Expressive Vocabulary	2.8	3.0	1.0	2.8	3.2	.6
Complete Sentences	2.4	3.0	.3	2.4	3.2	.2
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.8	2.8	-	2.8	3.2	.7
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.0	2.8	.8	3.0	3.4	.4
Responds to Questioning	3.2	3.4	.7	3.4	3.8	.3
Meaningful Intonation	2.4	2.8	.3	2.0	3.0	.05 *
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.0	3.0	-	3.0	3.2	.7
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.2	2.8	.3	2.8	3.2	.5

Table 16 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	2.8	-	2.6	3.0	.6
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.2	3.0	.7	3.0	3.4	.2
Total Scale Score	42.6	42.6	-	40.6	47.0	.3

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 16 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	2.8	-	2.6	3.0	.6
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.2	3.0	.7	3.0	3.4	.2
Total Scale Score	42.6	42.6	-	40.6	47.0	.3

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 17. Head Start Students, Middle Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.7	2.8	.6	2.3	2.9	.001*
Clear Enunciation	2.4	3.1	.02*	2.4	2.9	.003*
Spontaneous Expression	2.9	3.2	.3	2.5	3.1	.02*
Correct Use of Verbs	2.2	2.8	.03*	2.4	2.9	.01*
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.2	3.1	.001*	2.3	3.0	.002*
Expressive Vocabulary	2.7	3.2	.1	2.5	3.2	.01*
Complete Sentences	2.3	3.1	.02*	2.3	3.0	.006*
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.5	3.1	.02*	2.5	3.0	.03*
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.0	3.3	.3	2.7	2.8	.6
Responds to Questioning	3.0	3.3	.2	2.8	3.2	.05*
Meaningful Intonation	2.8	3.1	.3	2.2	3.0	.003*
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.0	3.5	.07	2.5	2.9	.05*
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.6	3.3	.07*	2.5	3.1	.01*

Table 17 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.3	3.0	.006*	2.2	2.9	.01*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.8	3.6	.06	2.7	3.2	.08
Total Scale Score	39.4	46.2	.07	36.8	45.2	.002*

*Difference statistically significant

** Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 18. Head Start Students, Low Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	1.7	2.6	.02*	1.9	2.3	.08
Clear Enunciation	1.6	2.4	.001*	1.9	2.1	.6
Spontaneous Expression	2.6	2.6	-	2.6	2.6	-
Correct Use of Verbs	1.9	2.4	.1	2.0	2.6	.2
Correct Use of Pronouns	1.7	2.4	.05*	2.3	2.6	.6
Expressive Vocabulary	2.1	2.6	.2	2.1	2.3	.7
Complete Sentences	2.0	2.3	.5	2.1	2.0	.4
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	1.9	2.3	.2	2.1	2.3	.6
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.4	2.7	.6	2.6	2.7	.7
Responds to Questioning	1.9	2.7	.08	2.4	2.6	.7
Meaningful Intonation	2.1	2.9	.05*	2.4	2.6	.6
Interacts Verbally with Group	2.0	2.9	.04*	2.1	2.4	.6
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	1.9	2.3	.3	2.4	2.4	-

Table 18 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	Mean Score Final	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	Mean Score Final	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	1.9	2.3	.08	2.0	2.3	.6
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	1.7	2.3	.3	2.1	2.4	.5
Total Scale Score	29.3	37.6	.02*	33.1	36.1	.3

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 19. Title I Students, High Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.9	3.4	.02*	2.9	3.3	.1
Clear Enunciation	3.0	3.3	.2	2.9	3.2	.1
Spontaneous Expression	3.3	3.6	.1	3.0	3.7	.006*
Correct Use of Verbs	3.0	3.5	.04*	2.9	3.1	.6
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.2	3.7	.02*	3.0	3.1	.7
Expressive Vocabulary	3.4	3.8	.09	2.9	3.6	.01*
Complete Sentences	3.2	3.7	.02*	2.9	3.1	.6
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.3	3.7	.04*	3.0	3.5	.2
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.3	3.8	.02*	3.2	3.7	.08
Responds to Questioning	3.6	3.8	.5	3.5	3.6	.5
Meaningful Intonation	3.0	3.6	.005*	2.8	3.5	.001*
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.1	3.5	.07	2.6	3.4	.04*
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.4	3.7	.7	2.7	3.5	.01*

Title 19 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher P	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher P
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	3.1	3.4	.2	3.0	3.4	.04*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.5	3.8	.09	2.8	3.3	.04*
Total Scale Score	48.3	54.2	.003*	44.0	51.2	.01*

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for pre-test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 20. Title I Students, Middle Reading Group, Grade 1. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.7	2.9	.6	2.5	2.8	.2
Clear Enunciation	2.7	2.6	.7	2.5	2.5	.7
Spontaneous Expression	2.7	3.1	.2	2.8	2.9	.7
Correct Use of Verbs	2.5	3.0	.07	2.3	2.4	.7
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.5	2.8	.2	2.7	2.5	.5
Expressive Vocabulary	2.7	3.0	.05*	2.5	2.6	.6
Complete Sentences	2.5	3.2	.007*	2.6	2.5	.6
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.5	3.0	.05*	3.0	2.7	.1
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.6	2.9	.2	2.5	2.9	.1
Responds to Questioning	2.9	3.1	.6	3.0	2.9	.7
Meaningful Intonation	2.7	3.0	.2	2.9	2.7	.2
Interacts Verbally With Group	2.5	3.0	.01*	2.3	2.5	.5
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.7	2.9	.3	2.7	2.5	.5

Table 20 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	Mean Score Final	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	Mean Score Final	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.5	2.7	.2	2.6	2.4	.6
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.8	2.7	.6	2.6	2.6	-
Total Scale Score	39.4	43.7	.01*	39.5	39.3	.9

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 21. Title I Students, Low Reading Group. Grade 1. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.0	2.4	.05*	1.9	2.3	.002*
Clear Enunciation	2.0	2.4	.02*	1.9	2.4	.004*
Spontaneous Expression	2.3	2.6	.07	2.4	2.6	.6
Correct Use of Verbs	1.9	2.3	.05*	1.9	2.2	.2
Correct Use of Pronouns	1.9	2.4	.05*	1.9	2.5	.04*
Expressive Vocabulary	2.1	2.5	.01*	2.2	2.5	.2
Complete Sentences	2.0	2.4	.04*	2.0	2.3	.1
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	1.9	2.2	.2	2.1	2.5	.03*
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.2	2.4	.3	2.4	2.5	.5
Responds to Questioning	2.3	2.5	.5	2.4	2.6	.1
Meaningful Intonation	2.0	2.6	.002*	1.9	2.7	.0002*
Interacts Verbally with Group	2.3	2.7	.05*	2.2	2.7	.1
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.3	2.3	-	2.0	2.5	.01*

Table 21 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	1.9	2.4	.008*	1.8	2.3	.01*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.1	2.5	.09	2.1	2.6	.04*
Total Scale Score	31.2	36.6	.004*	31.2	37.2	.005*

*Difference statistically significant

**Descrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

scores with significant differences. The second teacher rated seven items (three mechanical and four expressive) and total scores with significant differences. There was agreement between teachers on one item. Thus, while it is difficult to draw conclusions about which items show improvement, there is a definite indication of some improvement among this group. In the middle reading group, the first teacher found significant differences on four items (two mechanical and two expressive) and total score. The second teacher found none. Thus, there was less improvement among this group. In the low reading group, the first teacher rated nine items (eight mechanical and one expressive) and total score with significant differences and the second teacher rated eight items (five mechanical and three expressive) and total scores with significant differences. There was agreement on five items. Thus, the low group was the one among Title I students which showed the most improvement in oral language development, mostly in the area of mechanics.

Grade 2, Head Start vs. Title I

Tables 22-24 give the comparisons of Head Start and Title I students in the second grade for the post-test. Among the high reading group there are no significant differences. It is interesting to note, however, that on most of the items the Head Start students are now scoring higher than Title I students; this may indicate a trend, but should be viewed with caution since none of the differences are statistically significant. In the middle

reading group, again the Head Start students are scoring higher. The second teacher found three items with significant differences (two mechanical and one expressive). Thus, there is little difference between Head Start and Title I students in the middle reading group, although there is some difference in the pre-test. In the low reading group, the first teacher rated one item (mechanical) and the second teacher rated one item (expressive) with significant differences. Again, the Head Start students are scoring higher. Here, also, there is little difference between Head Start and Title I students.

Grade 2, High vs. Low, Head Start and Title I

Head Start

Table 25 shows the comparison of the high and low reading groups among second grade Head Start students. The first teacher rated two items (one mechanical and one expressive) and the second teacher rated one item (expressive) with significant differences. Thus, the second grade Head Start group was fairly homogeneous with regard to oral language development. This result confirmed one of the findings of the Fall testing.

Title I

Examination of Table 26 reveals that, among Title I students, the first teacher found eight items (seven mechanical and one

Table 22. High Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences Between Means, Final Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	3.0	2.9	.8	3.3	3.0	.6
Clear Enunciation	2.9	2.8	.9	3.0	2.8	.6
Spontaneous Expression	3.4	3.1	.6	3.3	3.2	.8
Correct Use of Verbs	3.0	2.9	.8	3.1	3.1	-
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.3	3.1	.5	3.3	3.2	.8
Expressive Vocabulary	3.4	2.9	.1	3.4	3.3	.8
Complete Sentences	3.4	3.4	-	3.0	3.2	.5
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.1	2.9	.6	3.5	3.2	.7
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.3	3.2	.8	3.6	3.3	.2
Responds to Questioning	3.4	3.2	.5	3.5	3.4	.7
Meaningful Intonation	2.9	2.9	.8	3.3	3.1	.6
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.6	3.2	.2	3.4	3.3	.9
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.3	3.1	.7	3.5	3.4	.7

Table 22 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	3.1	2.9	.6	3.0	3.0	-
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.0	3.3	.3	3.6	3.5	.7
Total Scale Score	47.9	45.9	.6	49.6	47.9	.6

Table 23. Middle Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences Between Means, Final Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher P	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher P
Accurate Pronunciation	2.6	2.8	.6	3.3	2.8	.1
Clear Enunciation	2.8	2.6	.6	3.0	2.9	.8
Spontaneous Expression	3.3	2.8	.1	3.3	2.9	.2
Correct Use of Verbs	2.5	2.7	.5	3.3	2.7	.03*
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.0	2.8	.5	3.4	2.8	.02*
Expressive Vocabulary	3.3	2.7	.1	2.9	2.8	.8
Complete Sentences	3.1	2.9	.5	3.3	2.8	.1
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.0	2.8	.5	3.3	3.0	.6
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.4	2.9	.2	3.8	3.1	.05*
Responds to Questioning	3.3	3.2	.9	3.4	3.2	.5
Meaningful Intonation	3.0	2.6	.3	3.1	2.8	.3
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.3	3.2	.8	3.4	2.9	.2
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.3	2.9	.3	3.3	2.9	.3

Table 23 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.6	2.8	.5	3.1	2.7	.1
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.1	3.2	.7	3.4	3.1	.6
Total Scale Score	45.4	42.9	.6	48.9	43.4	.09

*Difference statistically significant

Table 24. Low Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Head Start and Title I Students and Levels of Significance of Differences Between Means, Final Testing.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher P	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher P
Accurate Pronunciation	2.6	2.1	.09	2.6	2.4	.6
Clear Enunciation	2.9	1.9	.004*	2.8	2.3	.3
Spontaneous Expression	2.6	2.8	.7	3.1	3.0	.7
Correct Use of Verbs	2.8	2.3	.1	2.9	2.5	.2
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.6	2.5	.6	3.0	2.4	.06
Expressive Vocabulary	2.9	2.5	.3	2.6	2.5	.8
Complete Sentences	3.0	2.7	.5	2.9	2.8	.8
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.8	2.6	.7	2.5	2.5	.9
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.9	2.8	1.0	3.1	2.9	.7
Responds to Questioning	3.0	2.8	.6	3.4	3.1	.6
Meaningful Intonation	2.6	2.3	.5	3.0	2.5	.3
Interacts Verbally with Group	2.6	2.8	.5	3.3	2.5	.1
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.8	2.4	.7	2.9	2.5	.6

Table 24 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Head Start	1st Teacher Mean Score Title I	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Head Start	2nd Teacher Mean Score Title I	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.5	2.2	.5	2.6	2.3	.6
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.0	2.8	.5	3.4	2.6	.004*
Total Scale Score	41.5	37.7	.6	44.0	38.8	.2

*Difference statistically significant

Table 25. Head Start Students, Grade 2. Mean Scores of High and Low Reading Groups and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Final Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.9	2.6	.7	3.1	2.6	.2
Clear Enunciation	2.7	2.9	.5	3.0	2.8	.5
Spontaneous Expression	3.3	2.6	.3	3.1	3.1	-
Correct Use of Verbs	2.9	2.8	.6	3.0	2.9	.7
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.1	2.6	.05*	3.3	3.0	.6
Expressive Vocabulary	3.3	2.9	.7	3.3	2.6	.1
Complete Sentences	3.3	3.0	.5	3.0	2.9	.8
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.0	2.8	.6	3.4	2.5	.03*
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.1	2.9	.6	3.6	3.1	.3
Responds to Questioning	3.3	3.0	.6	3.4	3.4	.9
Meaningful Intonation	2.9	2.6	.7	3.3	3.0	.6
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.6	2.6	.03*	3.3	3.3	.9
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.1	2.8	.5	3.4	2.9	.09

Table 25 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	3.0	2.5	.3	2.9	2.6	.5
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.0	3.0	-	3.7	3.4	.3
Total Scale Score	46.4	41.5	.3	48.9	44.0	.2

*Difference statistically significant

Table 26. Title I Students, Grade 2. Mean Scores of High and Low Reading Groups and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means, Final Testing

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score High	2nd Teacher Mean Score Low	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.9	2.1	.002*	3.0	2.4	.03*
Clear Enunciation	2.8	1.9	.003*	2.8	2.3	.08
Spontaneous Expression	3.1	2.8	.5	3.2	3.0	.7
Correct Use of Verbs	2.9	2.3	.02*	3.1	2.5	.03*
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.1	2.5	.02*	3.2	2.4	.007*
Expressive Vocabulary	2.9	2.5	.09	3.3	2.5	.06
Complete Sentences	3.4	2.7	.02*	3.2	2.8	.2
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.9	2.6	.2	3.2	2.5	.01*
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.2	2.8	.6	3.3	2.9	.3
Responds to Questioning	3.2	2.8	.2	3.4	3.1	.2
Meaningful Intonation	2.9	2.3	.06	3.1	2.5	.1
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.2	2.8	.2	3.3	2.5	.02*
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.1	2.4	.01*	3.4	2.5	.01*

Table 26 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score High	1st Teacher Mean Score Low	1st Teacher p	2md Teacher Mean Score High	2md Teacher Mean Score Low	2md Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.9	2.2	.02*	3.0	2.3	.02*
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.3	2.8	.02*	3.5	2.6	.003*
Total Scale Score	45.9	37.7	.008*	47.9	38.8	.01*

*Difference statistically significant

expressive) and total score, and the second teacher found eight items (five mechanical and three expressive) and total scores with significant differences. There was agreement on six items (five mechanical and one expressive). Thus, the Title I group was still less homogeneous than the Head Start group. This appeared most in the mechanical aspects of oral language ability.

Grade 2, Pre-test vs. Post-test, Head Start and Title I

Head Start

Tables 27-29 show the differences between pre- and post-test results for Head Start students. In the high reading group, only the second teacher rated two items (both expressive) with significant differences. In this group, therefore, there had been little improvement during the school year. This held true for the middle and low reading groups as well. In the middle group, again only the second teacher found two items (one mechanical and one expressive) with significant differences. In the low group, only the second teacher found one item (mechanical) with significant differences. Thus the level of oral language development for second grade Head Start students had remained essentially the same throughout the school year.

Title I

Tables 30-32 show the differences between pre- and post-test results for Title I students. In the high reading group, there

Table 27. Head Start Students, High Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	3.0	3.0	-	2.9	3.3	.2
Clear Enunciation	2.6	2.9	.4	2.8	3.0	.5
Spontaneous Expression	3.3	3.4	.7	3.1	3.3	.6
Correct Use of Verbs	3.0	3.0	-	2.9	3.1	.5
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.9	3.3	.08	2.9	3.3	.08
Expressive Vocabulary	3.1	3.4	.5	2.9	3.4	.2
Complete Sentences	3.1	3.4	.5	2.9	3.0	.7
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.1	3.1	-	3.3	3.5	.4
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.3	3.3	-	3.0	3.6	.05*
Responds to Questioning	3.3	3.4	.4	3.1	3.5	.2
Meaningful Intonation	3.0	2.9	.6	2.9	3.3	.2
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.3	3.6	.08	3.5	3.4	.6
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.3	3.3	-	3.3	3.5	.4

Table 27 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	3.1	.3	3.0	3.0	-
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.3	3.0	.4	3.3	3.6	.3
Total Scale Score	46.1	47.9	.5	45.5	49.6	.07

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 28. Head Start Students, Middle Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.6	2.6	-	3.0	3.3	.4
Clear Enunciation	2.6	2.8	.4	3.0	3.0	-
Spontaneous Expression	3.4	3.3	.7	3.4	3.3	.6
Correct Use of Verbs	2.8	2.5	.5	2.8	3.3	.03*
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.0	3.0	-	2.8	3.4	.09
Expressive Vocabulary	3.3	3.3	-	3.1	2.9	.5
Complete Sentences	2.9	3.1	.5	2.9	3.3	.08
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	3.4	3.0	.2	3.1	3.3	.4
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.4	3.4	-	2.9	3.8	.006*
Responds to Questioning	3.3	3.3	-	3.3	3.4	.7
Meaningful Intonation	3.1	3.0	.6	3.1	3.1	-
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.1	3.3	.6	3.3	3.4	.4
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.4	3.3	.7	3.3	3.3	-

Table 28 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.6	2.6	-	2.9	3.1	.2
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.3	3.1	.7	3.3	3.4	.7
Total Scale Score	46.0	45.4	.8	45.9	48.9	.1

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 29. Head Start Students, Low Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.4	2.6	.2	2.0	2.6	.05*
Clear Enunciation	2.5	2.9	.2	2.6	2.8	.7
Spontaneous Expression	2.8	2.6	.8	2.9	3.1	.4
Correct Use of Verbs	2.6	2.8	.7	2.4	2.9	.1
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.8	2.6	.7	2.8	3.0	.2
Expressive Vocabulary	2.8	2.9	.6	2.3	2.6	.4
Complete Sentences	2.4	3.0	.09	2.8	2.9	.8
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.5	2.8	.6	2.5	2.5	-
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.8	2.9	.7	3.3	3.1	.7
Responds to Questioning	2.8	3.0	.4	2.9	3.4	.3
Meaningful Intonation	2.6	2.6	-	2.4	3.0	.2
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.0	2.6	.2	2.8	3.3	.1
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.6	2.8	.7	2.8	2.9	.7

Table 29 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	Mean Score Final	p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	Mean Score Final	p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.5	2.5	-	2.4	2.6	.5
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.6	3.0	.3	2.9	3.4	.2
Total Scale Score	39.5	41.5	.5	39.4	44.0	.2

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 30. Title I Students, High Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.7	2.9	.2	2.9	3.0	.6
Clear Enunciation	2.7	2.8	.2	2.7	2.8	.5
Spontaneous Expression	3.1	3.1	.8	3.0	3.2	.6
Correct Use of Verbs	2.9	2.9	.7	2.9	3.1	.3
Correct Use of Pronouns	3.1	3.1	-	3.0	3.2	.3
Expressive Vocabulary	2.9	2.9	-	2.9	3.3	.1
Complete Sentences	3.3	3.4	.5	2.9	3.2	.2
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.9	2.9	.8	3.1	3.2	.5
Speaks Self-Confidently	3.2	3.2	-	3.3	3.3	.8
Responds to Questioning	3.3	3.2	.6	3.3	3.4	.6
Meaningful Intonation	2.4	2.9	.06	2.6	3.1	.07
Interacts Verbally with Group	3.2	3.2	.7	3.2	3.3	.6
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	3.1	3.1	-	2.9	3.4	.07

Table 30 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.8	2.9	.6	2.8	3.0	.6
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	3.3	3.3	-	3.3	3.5	.6
Total Scale Score	44.8	45.9	.5	44.7	47.9	.2

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 31. Title I Students, Middle Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.5	2.8	.1	2.5	2.8	.1
Clear Enunciation	2.5	2.6	.3	2.4	2.9	.04*
Spontaneous Expression	2.7	2.8	.8	2.3	2.9	.01*
Correct Use of Verbs	2.5	2.7	.2	2.3	2.7	.05*
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.5	2.8	.1	2.4	2.8	.06
Expressive Vocabulary	2.8	2.8	-	2.4	2.8	.07
Complete Sentences	2.7	2.9	.6	2.3	2.8	.01*
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.5	2.8	.2	2.7	3.0	.3
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.7	2.9	.2	2.7	3.1	.2
Responds to Questioning	2.9	3.2	.1	3.0	3.2	.5
Meaningful Intonation	2.8	2.6	.3	2.5	2.8	.7
Interacts Verbally with Group	2.7	3.2	.004*	2.6	2.9	.2
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.6	2.9	.05*	2.5	2.9	.1

Table 31 (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.6	2.8	.3	2.4	2.7	.3
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.9	3.2	.1	2.7	3.1	.08
Total Scale Score	39.7	42.9	.06	37.7	43.4	.03*

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

Table 32. Title I Students, Low Reading Group, Grade 2. Mean Scores of Initial and Final Testing and Levels of Significance of Differences between Means.

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Accurate Pronunciation	2.0	2.1	.7	1.9	2.4	.05*
Clear Enunciation	2.0	1.9	.7	2.2	2.3	.6
Spontaneous Expression	2.6	2.8	.6	2.2	3.0	.02*
Correct Use of Verbs	2.3	2.3	-	2.1	2.5	.05*
Correct Use of Pronouns	2.4	2.5	.6	2.2	2.4	.3
Expressive Vocabulary	2.2	2.5	.3	2.2	2.5	.3
Complete Sentences	2.5	2.7	.6	1.8	2.8	.005*
Expresses Ideas Verbally with Facility	2.2	2.6	.08	1.9	2.5	.1
Speaks Self-Confidently	2.5	2.8	.1	2.3	2.9	.08
Responds to Questioning	2.4	2.8	.03*	2.6	3.1	.05*
Meaningful Intonation	2.3	2.3	-	2.0	2.5	.2
Interacts Verbally with Group	2.4	2.8	.05*	2.6	2.5	.8
Expresses Judgments & Inferences Verbally	2.3	2.4	.7	2.2	2.5	.05*

Table 32. (Continued)

Oral Language Development Scale	1st Teacher Mean Score Initial**	1st Teacher Mean Score Final	1st Teacher p	2nd Teacher Mean Score Initial**	2nd Teacher Mean Score Final	2nd Teacher p
Uses Adjectives Meaningfully	2.2	2.2	-	1.8	2.3	.08
Relates Facts & Ideas Logically	2.5	2.8	.6	2.2	2.6	.1
Total Scale Score	34.8	37.7	.2	32.4	38.8	.02*

*Difference statistically significant

**Discrepancies between these means and those reported for initial test due to exclusion of some of the original sample because of attrition.

were no significant differences. In the middle reading group, the first teacher found two items (both expressive) and the second teacher found four items (three mechanical and one expressive) and total score with significant differences. There had been slight improvement in this group. In the low reading group, the first teacher found two items (both expressive) and the second teacher found six items (three mechanical and three expressive) and total score with significant differences. There was agreement on one item (expressive). Thus, there has been some improvement in this group; just how much depends upon which teacher one chooses.

Summary and Conclusions

In the first grade, we begin to see some differences between Head Start and Title I students. In the top reading group, the Title I students show some superiority, but in the middle group, the Head Start students show a higher level of language ability. Since there is so little agreement between the teachers regarding which items have significant differences it is difficult to interpret these results. However, we do see the extension of a trend which was noticeable during the initial testing. The Head Start group again shows up as much more homogeneous than the Title I group--even more so than in the Fall.

In the second grade we find little, if any, difference between Head Start and Title I students on any reading level. The Head Start group is still more homogeneous than the Title I group, although the latter is more so than it was in the Fall. The differences in the Title I students between high and low reading groups now show up in the mechanical aspects of oral language ability, whereas previously they were found in both mechanical and expressive aspects.

When we compare pre-post test results, we find in grade one that the Head Start group has made most of its gains in the middle reading group, especially in the mechanical aspects of language ability. Most of the improvement for Title I youngsters is found in the low reading group, again in mechanical aspects. There is less improvement for any of the children in the second grade, although more for the Title I children than for Head Start children.

From the results of our study, there appears to have been somewhat of a reversal of the positions of the two grades during the course of the school year. It will be remembered that in the Fall we found little difference between Head Start and Title I children in grade one, while there were definite differences between the two groups in grade two. In the Spring we find

differences (albeit on different reading levels and in different aspects or oral language) between Head Start and Title I children in the first grade but essentially no differences in the second grade. It is difficult, therefore, to draw any definite conclusions about trends in where the differences lie between Head Start and Title I children. The most clear-cut distinction we can find between the Head Start and Title I groups is that the former is much more homogeneous with regard to oral language ability than the latter. Even this distinction, though, appears to begin to fade out by the end of the second grade.

These observations suggest the possibility of more accurate determination of the development of oral language proficiency of Head Start and Title I children by future follow-up studies. For example, what happens when these children reach the third, or even fourth, fifth and sixth grades? Does the heterogeneity of the Title I group fade out even more than it does by the end of the second grade? Are more recent Head Start programs, such as the current one and future ones, more effective in promoting oral language development than the two early ones? Since so little is known in the field of the oral language development of culturally different children, it would be worthwhile to try to find the answers to these questions.

REFERENCES

Barke, Ethel M. and Williams, D. E. Parry. "A Further Study of the Comparative Intelligence of Children in Certain Bilingual and Monoglot Schools in South Wales," British Journal of Educational Psychology. (February, 1938).

Bernstein, Basil. "A Public Language," British Journal of Sociology. (December, 1959), pp. 311-323.

Bloom, Genjamin S., Davis, Allison, and Hess, Robert. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1965.

Hutt, Max L., and Gibby, Robert G. The Child: Development and Adjustment. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1959.

Manuel, Herschel T. Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1965.

Mead, George Herbert. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Mukerji, Rose and Robison, Helen F., "A Head Start in Language," Elementary English, XLIII, 5 (May, 1966).

Reissman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

_____. "The Culturally Deprived Child: A New View," in Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1963, No. 17, 1963.

Ruddell, Robert B. "Oral Language and the Development of Other Language Skills," Elementary English, XLIII, 5 (May, 1966).

Strickland, Ruth G. "Language Readiness for Oral Reading," in Oral Aspects of Reading, ed. Helen M. Robinson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 82, December, 1955.

Thomas, D. "Oral Language, Sentence Structure and Vocabulary of Kindergarten Children Living in Low Socio-Economic Urban Areas." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne University, 1963.

Tireman, L. S. Teaching Spanish-Speaking Children. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1948.

Walters, Fred C. "Bilingualism," Puerto Rico School Review, 20 (January, 1935).

OEO
PS

FROM:
ERIC FACILITY
SUITE 601
1735 EYE STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006